

Remarks

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application, and stand rejected. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Georgiou et al. ("Georgiou") (US 5,940,785) in view of Ko (US 6,192,479). To establish a prima facie case of obviousness under § 103, all claim limitations of a claimed invention must be taught or suggested by the prior art. See MPEP, Section 2143.03 and In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

In view of the foregoing authority, the asserted rejection cannot be sustained for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose a performance demanding level input to determine a level of sensitivity for frequency reduction as recited in claim 1, or the limitation "based on determining a level of sensitivity for frequency reduction" as recited in each of independent claims 7 and 12.

The Examiner acknowledges that "Georgiou did not disclose expressly a performance demanding level input to determine a level of sensitivity for frequency reduction." The Examiner cites Ko as providing the teaching absent from Georgiou. Specifically, the Examiner cites Ko's FIG. 5, and col. 7, lines 7-16 and col. 8, lines 1-12 of Ko.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of the cited portions of Ko. These portions in no way suggest a *determining a level of sensitivity* as required by the present claims. Instead, they only show a linear correspondence between a required performance and a clock frequency. That is, as required performance increases, so does frequency (linearly), and as required performance decreases, so does frequency (linearly). In the latter arrangement, there is no "level" and no "sensitivity." Put another way, in Ko there is only one rate or mode of frequency reduction -- that indicated by the slope of the line in FIG. 5. There is no suggestion that the slope is sensitive or responsive to any factor. Thus, since there is no level of sensitivity in Ko, there

can furthermore be no determination of such a level.

By contrast, in embodiments of the present invention, a level of sensitivity for frequency reduction can be higher or lower. This feature is described in more detail in the present specification at page 7, line 8 to page 8, line 2. As described, if the PDL signal 311 is asserted, for example, the level of sensitivity for frequency reduction may be higher, thereby calling for finer granularity in frequency reduction (e.g., 1/15 reduction from normal frequency). On the other hand, if the PDL signal 311 is not asserted, for example, the level of sensitivity for frequency reduction may be lower, thereby calling for aggressive frequency reduction (e.g., close to 50% reduction from normal frequency). The determination of the level of sensitivity for frequency reduction may be based, for example, on what kind of application is being executed.

In view of the foregoing, independent claims 1, 7 and 12 are allowable over Georgiou. Moreover, since the dependent claims incorporate the limitations of the independent claims, they are likewise allowable for at least the reasons discussed in connection with the independent claims. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-17 is therefore respectfully requested.


In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in all aspects in allowable condition, and earnestly solicits favorable reconsideration and early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 220-4323 to discuss any matter concerning this application. The Office is authorized to charge any fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 related to this communication to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: JUL 13, 2004

By:


William E. Curry
Reg. No. 43,572

KENYON & KENYON
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 220-4200
Fax: (202) 220-4201